









### CHURCH TROUBLES.

[illegible]

### Decisions of Court of Appeals.

From the Kentucky Yearman,  
*Sherrill's Bond for County Levy—Surrender*  
 The following is a copy of the County Court  
 records:  
 Evans, Secy., vs. Sherrill, Plaintiff vs. County Court,  
 Judgment delivered by Judge Peters on 12th  
 day of March, 1885.  
 Clark, as sheriff of Mifflin county, was  
 entered into bond, with the appellants as  
 sureties, to appear before the County Court  
 Court, to collect and pay over the levy for  
 the levy of said county for the year 1885.  
 The sheriff failed to appear before the  
 County Court, and the County Court, there-  
 upon, ordered the sheriff to appear with his  
 personal representatives to settle with the  
 commissioner reported a balance, due from  
 the sheriff to the county, and the County Court  
 instituted against the appellants as sureties  
 a writ of attachment.  
 In making the settlement, the com-  
 missioner charged the sheriff with \$1,000  
 for the year 1885, and the County Court, for  
 previous years, in addition to the  
 levy for 1885.  
 The County Court judgment was given against  
 the appellants.  
 Appeal.—That the judgment was erroneous.  
 The sheriff is required by section 2  
 of the act of 1878, to appear before the County  
 Court each year before he proceeds to collect  
 the county levy, to execute bond, with  
 sufficient sureties, to pay over to the county  
 officers and to the county the payment of the  
 amount of the levy for that particular  
 year.  
 Considering the bond sued on in the  
 light of the law, and according to the  
 terms of the bond, it is evident that the  
 terms of the bond, it must be evident  
 that the appellants are not responsible  
 on the bond of 1885 for county  
 levies for Clark collected for  
 previous years.  
*Attorney General vs. Henderson, et al.*  
*Attorney General, Plaintiff vs. Henderson, et al.,*  
 Defendants.  
 Judgment delivered by Judge Peters on 12th  
 day of March, 1885.  
 Evans, Secy., vs. Sherrill, Plaintiff vs. County Court,  
 Judgment delivered by Judge Peters on 12th  
 day of March, 1885.  
 A number of creditors of Wm. Jacobus  
 sued out separate attachments against  
 Sherrill, and the County Court, without  
 an order of consolidation, some of the  
 sheriff being permitted to testify in  
 his own behalf.  
 The following points are decided in  
 this case:  
 These several plaintiffs were no parties

ties to the issue as to the others, nor were they interested, as each must stand upon the evidence he produced, and his

[illegible]

mortgage debt exhausts the mortgage premises of dwelling house and appurtenant lands, not leaving a surplus

though it be more than one thousand dollars in value, he is precluded from doing so. The same rule applies to the other lands, because this would be extending the homestead right beyond the limits of the act.

If a commissioner can, under the judgment, sell tracts of land in parcels, it is not necessary that the object of the law be to inform the public that a sale of certain property will occur. It is sufficient to say that the object is to inform the public that there is a possibility of an error to certain parcels of land made in different parcels from those named in the act.

Judgment confirming sales reverse except as to sale to Burlington, which is affirmed.

**LIFE INSURANCE AMONG THE RAILROADS.**  
—*Continued.*

Our telegraphic dispatches recently contained a report of the proceedings of the directors of the Great Northern at Cincinnati, for the purpose of organizing a life insurance company, connected with the railroad system of that section. The following is the report of the delegate sent by the conductors of the

branches:  
BOWLINGGREEN, Nov. 21, 1928

[illegible]

will be distributed to all conductors of the year's experience on this road, who

[illegible]



